

# 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



<b>Applicant Name:</b>	<b>Brownstown Central Community Schools Corporation</b>
<b>Proposal Ranking:</b>	24
<b>Average Score</b>	113 /125

## Proposal Strengths:

- Overall the applicant presents a good proposal with several strong areas - staffing, communication, and evaluation.
- This was a really well organized and thought out grant. There seems to be a demonstrated need. I thought the wrap-around services were thoughtful and appropriate and I appreciated the intentionality in which the partners were assembled. BRS seems like they have the history of being able to manage and execute an effective afterschool program so I am not concerned with their ability to do the work. I also know the importance of the connection between the school and the afterschool program and it seems like they have a good plan to make sure that will occur. I was also impressed by BRS's dedication to PD and their PD plan. It was apparent that they value education not only as an organization but also in investing in their own team members. They clearly see the connection between equipping their staff with the knowledge and tools that will enable them to be more effective in their jobs whether they are front line staff or managers.
- Application is well written and cohesive. Applicant and host site demonstrate a strong dedication to serving students and have identified clear needs. BRS has experience serving families in rural areas and this application outlines a plan to treat parents as collaborators. Schedule appears well-rounded and there is an emphasis on interactive, engaging program that does not simply replicate a classroom experience but still enhances academic learning.

## Proposal Weaknesses:

- The partnership between the applicant and the school was not clarified very well. How specific partners were identified to support the program was not clear.
- There was a discussion of the fact that the afterschool activities will be engaging and different than what is occurring during the school day, but other than a surface level mention of that, there was never really any description of how the activities are different. It seemed like there will be a heavy reliance on MyON which is already being used during the school day which runs counter to the argument that the activities will be different than a school day. Also, I could be incorrect because it wasn't clear in the narrative, but it seems like many of the activities are computer-based. Yes, children like computer activities, but out of school time needs to have a wide variety of activities including small and large group activities rather than primarily computer-based instruction. There were areas that lacked specifics or attention to detail that I think would have enabled them to have achieved a higher score. A table with the specific

# 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



days of the week and activities by age group would have been a more desirable schedule from a reviewer's perspective. It just seemed like you had a rough sketch of what you would like to have, but the application called for a detailed schedule and as much tentative detail you can provide (we know it can change) helps the reviewer get a better sense of what you are planning on.

- Professional development specific to literacy isn't included in the PD plan. Students will not experience physical activity or free play time during which they can practice SEL skills taught by curriculum being used if they are bused home at 5:00pm each day.

## Top Areas Where Points Were Lost:

- Program Design